

CIRCULAR.

The Discussion Relative to the Mt. Carroll Seminary.

[CONTINUED.]

I take this method of calling the attention of the public to some gross misrepresentations which I find in a pamphlet purporting, nominally and mainly, to have emanated from N. Halderman, as replying to Rev. C. Gray.

In my opinion, justice demands for this community generally, as well as for Mr. Gray, that a more full and correct statement be made public relative to some of the absurdities contained in that pamphlet. It appears that the discussion has at last reached a point at which Mr. H. is willing to have it stop, and has ceased making further "demands," having (as he thinks) slain all whose puny voices have been raised in opposition to his, (except that of the *Boy* editor) he has no more to do, and if the reason assigned is the correct one, it is a little singular that his pamphlet should manifest the tone which it does. And however much I, with others, may sympathize with Mr. H. in his affliction, yet it in no wise lessens the sympathy we entertain for Rev. C. Gray, in enduring the contaminating influence of the false charge brought against him by Messrs. Rinewalt & Halderman, that he was the originator of the distilling business in Mt. Carroll.

There are many persons, having come into this community since the Hydraulic Company engaged in the distilling business, who are not acquainted with the facts in the case, (as they are known to have existed, by a large portion of the population) and are inclined to give credit to the charge. Therefore, being in possession of the facts, as I am, I feel it to be my duty to exonerate Mr. Gray from the charge, if I can do so through a plain statement of facts concerning the matter. It is submitting to enough to know that there are hundreds, at a distance, who will receive the pamphlet containing this charge, who, of course, will believe it, having never heard the other side of the question. But, to allow so

groundless a fabrication to fasten a stigma upon the reputation of a venerable and worthy minister of the Gospel, in a community where the facts are known to be otherwise, it is intolerable, and while I have a voice, it shall be heard in defending the innocent.

I am well aware that, by taking this step I may expose myself to the same vindictive and slanderous attacks which is characteristic of the writings that have come out against Mr. Gray, and others, simply for *daring* to speak the truth; but if it is my duty to remain silent while seeing an innocent and worthy citizen wrongfully crushed, without any just cause, I have yet to learn it. Messrs. Rinewalt & Halderman, finding it impossible to effect an overthrow of Rev. C. Gray's arguments, fairly and honorably, have sought to slide out of their unpleasant position by attempting to destroy his moral standing, through a puny and contradictory effort, unaccompanied by a solemn declaration, made by John Rinewalt, (with an uplified hand).

1st. That Mr. Gray was the first individual that ever "suggested" and "recommended" the distillery business, in this place, when, to the best of my knowledge, Messrs. R. & H. had been talking about the distillery, months before Mr. Gray heard of it at all.

2d. That the article recommended to be made was Highwines, when I believe that I can now prove by all of the then stockholders, (with but few exceptions,) that the word *Highwines* never escaped their (R. & H.'s) lips while persuading persons to take stock.

3d. That these *Highwines* were no more like a beverage than that of which they were made of, viz: wheat, corn, &c. This must have been an awful mistake, for the stuff made by the Hydraulic Company, called *Highwines*, (not wheat, corn, &c.,) is used as a beverage, in this town, regularly.— If Mr. Rinewalt was so profoundly ignorant

as to need the Rev. gentleman's instructions as to what *Highwines* and *Whisky* was, or was not, (*very reasonable*;) how did he happen to forget both of those words, and call it 95 proof *Alcohol*, to the first would be stockholder he met on the street afterwards!

4th. That being engaged in distilling *Highwines* (*alias* High Whiskey,) was as *honorable* and *just* a business as could be followed. This fourth perversion is too preposterously absurd to have been uttered by any *temperance* man in this age of the world, who is endowed with *half* a share of *common sense*, and I certainly can have no more favorable opinion of any man who could *greedily* *gulf* it down, and then *boast* of its having been the *basis* upon which to establish *such* a concern as the Mt. Carroll Distillery, where the so-called *Highwines* are made *low* enough to be used as a beverage.

Those who have known Rev. C. Gray, in this community, the last twelve years, will not be satisfied with such a mess of *butterdash*, when I tell them that I can substantiate the fact that Mr. R. has voluntarily stated, that before he would be guilty of making an article which could be used as a beverage, he would suffer his right arm (*upon which is that uplifted hand*) to drop from his shoulder, and now he is engaged in doing this *very thing*, while he tells us that he does not consider there is any *immorality* about it, except that it don't *pay*. He has, at another time in a public meeting, said that he not only considered this an honorable, but a *Holy work*. And why? Because it was in the hands, and under the entire control, of *temperance men* who would not suffer the article made to be used for any purpose whatever, except *mechanical* and *medicinal*. Now, the stuff goes no farther than Fulton, or Freeport, before it is made into Whisky.

Now, when that uplifted hand is weighed, how much consistency is there in Mr. R.'s fabrication, when compared with the facts in the case. It certainly can effect none except those who are beyond the reach of the truth.

I have been more intimate with Mr. Gray, since the time the Hydraulic Stock was taken, than any man in this community, and think I have as correct a view of his position, relative to that concern, as any one. The same season that the stock was taken, Mr. R. had been East, and, on his return, said that he had ascertained that the manufacture of Alcohol—95 proof—would be the most profitable business that could be gone into, and

that it could be conducted upon strictly *temperance principles*, by running it up so high that it *could not* be reduced to a beverage. He also said he then had an offer, from a burning fluid establishment, of twenty-five per cent. profit, over cost at the distillery, for all the 95 proof Alcohol, that they could make for five years; yet there was no doubt but that fifty per cent. could be realized from it. These were the inducements held out to the community. Many of the best temperance men in the place, were induced to take stock by his flattering statements.—He had no doubt but that it could be controlled until it was made into burning fluid. He had investigated this subject *satisfactorily*. We believed that they could control it from the whisky traffic; and we believed they would do so. In fact, we believed every word they said in relation to the subject. They were then considered as being among our *best temperance men*; and why not trust them in such a business, if any one! I, with others, owe it to Mr. Gray alone, that we were not largely involved in the Hydraulic Stock. His advice to us was not to touch it. He said that he did not doubt the honesty and intentions of Messrs. R. & H., in the least, but there was doubt, as to what changes might take place, for the great profits then realized from 95 proof Alcohol and burning fluid, would be likely to induce many more establishments of the kind, to be put in operation, than could make it pay. He also said that we could have no assurance that the concern would not pass into the control of other parties who would make nothing but whisky. These are the reasons I gave for not taking stock. Still, I was confident they would fulfil their pledge, in making Alcohol, and restrain it from the whisky traffic. But there were those in this community who saw farther, and battled it stoutly, from the first. Some *knowing ones* have denied that ever anything was said about what *use* the stuff should be applied to. But Mr. H. sets this part of the subject upon its *right basis* by saying that it was "*to be converted into burning fluid, and was not to be sold in such a manner as to bring reproach upon the Company, for vending it as intoxicating liquors*;" and that their "*intention in regard to the use to which the Highwines should be applied has been conscientiously fulfilled*."—How Mr. H. can console himself with the idea that an intelligent community (the most of whom are in possession of the facts relative to the motives held up to the public, while inducing persons to

take stock) is going to be *handaged* with his clumsy statements, is quite a mystery to many.

Let us see how well they will bear investigation. He says, emphatically, that their intentions have been conscientiously fulfilled. Now the question comes up as to what that "intention" originally was — If it was at first to do just what has been done, why were the stockholders and the public generally, deceived by the repeated and re-repeated declaration of Messrs R. & H., that nothing short of 95 proof Alcohol should be made and sold by the Company, and that this article (not "Highwines") would not be allowed to pass into the control of any one who would permit it to be "converted" into any, and whatever, except mechanical and medicinal? But, if their "intention" was then just what they publicly declared it was, what a wonderful elastic process must have been wrought upon their "consciences," which once were so keen and sensitive as to refuse to sell a gallon of an article, (with which to make pickles,) which was the same as that now sold by the wagon load, to be converted into whisky. What "conscientiousness" must a man have to come down from the "intention" of making 95 proof Alcohol, to be run up to burning fluid, to the making of "Highwines," (alias High whisky) to be run down to low whisky? But "conscience" approves it all. If their faculties generally are as badly warped as their "consciences" are, it will be easy to account for the villifying tone that characterizes the articles published against Rev. C. Gray, for venturing to speak the truth which they have, as yet, been unable to disprove.

If their equivocations and "ipse dixit" were argument, they might have some show of success; but it is not, and they know it, else why take up with the contemptible alternative of wrongfully endeavoring, through "artifice" and stratagem, to ruin the moral standing of a venerable minister of the Gospel, by their faint pretense, that he was the origin of the Mr. Carroll distillery, hoping in this way to effect something against his otherwise indisputable arguments, among those unacquainted with him. This is carrying out the principle of killing an innocent man, to avoid the truth of his testimony. Nevertheless, it must be done. — Truth shall not prevail.

I now publicly defy the whole "Hydraulic Company," and all their coadjutors, to prove, fairly, the following statements:

1st, That "John Binewalt" is not the

identical person who first suggested the distilling business to Mr. Carroll.

2d, That, at first, Messrs. R. & H. said they "intended" to "manufacture" and sell "Highwines."

3d, That the "Hydraulic Company" was not the "Company" of 95 proof Alcohol made, as stated in the "Company."

4th, That there ever has been a "Company" of 95 proof Alcohol made, as stated in the "Company."

5th, That Messrs. R. & H. did not intend to make "Highwines" until they were fully convinced that it was their "intention" to do so only a short time, until they were able to procure the necessary material with which to run it up to "Highwines" as first intended!

6th, To show how they have "conscientiously fulfilled" their first "intentions," by selling the "Highwines" to whisky distillers or whisky merchants, promiscuously.

Now, if an "investigation is demanded," I claim that it shall be under the following stipulations:

1st. I shall be allowed the right to say something in regard to the preparatory steps.

2d. I must have more than "twenty-four hours notice," and that the time shall not be in the night.

3d. The "Hydraulic Company" shall not be the "investigating" tribunal.

4th. Evidence shall be admissible from outside of the Distillery family.

5th. If an "adjournment" is urged, for a good and "sufficient" reason, it shall be granted.

Mr. H.'s attack upon the "Union School movement" is unaccountable, except upon the principle that all "movements" must be crushed, or snubbed to his back and nod. He says, "The feelings of chagrin and disappointment felt by the originators of this Union School movement in having their base designs frustrated, was another fruitful source of mischief toward the Seminary." Such a statement as this, made in direct opposition to the facts, is enough to justify the conclusion that the people of Mr. Carroll cannot expect any good "movement" will be tolerated by Mr. H. and his fraternity, unless it emanates from himself, or the "Seminary."

The "Union School" had been in successful operation for months before the circulation of Mr. H.'s pamphlet, to the full satisfaction of all interested. It is attended by over 300 pupils, and is under the charge of Miss L. C. Witt, principal, Miss L. Pyle and Miss Harmon, assistants, and Prof. Lawrence, teacher of Latin.

gungees, in the Higher Department, and Messrs. A. J. Forbes and D. F. Croise, in the Primary Department, all of whom are as well qualified for their respective positions, as any in the State. This is an explanation of "*base design frustrated*," according to the version of Mr. H., who also says, in replying to the editor of the *Republican*, through the *Base Intelligencer* of Feb. 15th, "that, upon careful reflection, I see no cause to change my views relative to *any* of the statements contained in my pamphlet. 'What I have written, I have written.'"

If we, the free-born citizens of this great American Republic, residing *west* of Mason & Dixon's line, cannot be allowed the right to establish our own institutions of learning, in our own way, when in accordance with the laws of the State, without having our motives stigmatized (by Mr. H., or any one else,) as being "*base designs*," then I say it is time for the people to get waked up to a defence of their own rights.

In establishing a "Graded Union School" upon the proper basis, we educate our children in the common branches, for the *actual cost only*, and that, too, economically applied. But Mr. H. says that in this "movement" we have a "*base design*," because we do not choose to pay twice the amount, for the same purpose, in another direction, and under other systems, that the pecuniary interest of a few may be enhanced thereby. If this principle will stand the test, it is a "*base design*" in Mr. H. for getting his property insured in *mutual* insurance company for the *actual cost*, when, if he would pay twice the amount to a *stock* company for the same purpose, it would add underr-

ally to the interest of the stockholders.

This principle is also applicable to the farmer who, instead of selling his wheat to Mr. H., gets it thrashed at a country mill, and brings it to market, realizing a greater profit from it to himself, which might have been in Mr. H.'s pocket, had it not been for his "*base design*" in refusing to regard his own interest, rather than that of Mr. H.

A jealous portion of the community (by whom I regard Mr. H., as having been used as a tool) who, being ardent friends of the "Seminary," have attacked the "Union School" as being a much dreaded enemy, and then, comparing the motives of others by their own, conclude that all those who favor the "Union School" must be " bitter enemies of the "Seminary." But this is not so; for we do not oppose the "Seminary" as an institution, but regard it as being a good one, in its capacity. Yet we think the citizens of Carroll *have* reason to complain of the manner in which they have been treated by the Principals, when compared with the terms upon which they obtained the "Seminary."

This furious rivalry is all out of place, and unequalled for. Let each stand upon its own basis. There is a demand for both, and enough for each to do, in its proper sphere. It is said that the "Seminary" is full, and the "Union School" is too much crowded, for convenience.—Both *should* and *will* be sustained.

In writing the above, I have intended to make no exaggerations, and believe that I have made no statement that I am not able to sustain, in a fair investigation.

JAMES HALLETT.

Mt. Carroll, March 1th, 1858.